

DEAN M. CONWAY  
SARRA CHO  
Email: [conwayd@sec.gov](mailto:conwayd@sec.gov)

Attorneys for Plaintiff  
Securities and Exchange Commission  
100 F Street NE  
Washington, DC 20549  
Telephone: (202) 551-4412  
Facsimile: (202) 772-9245

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE  
COMMISSION,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ARI J. LAUER,

Defendant.

2:22-CV-01726-CKD

**NOTICE OF RELATED CASES  
[E.D. LOCAL RULE 123]**

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE  
COMMISSION,

Plaintiff,

vs.

JEFFREY P. CARPOFF and  
PAULETTE CARPOFF,

Defendants.

2:20-CV-00180-JAM-AC

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

REAL PROPERTY LOCATED AT 725  
MAIN STREET, MARTINEZ,  
CALIFORNIA, CONTRA COSTA

2:19-CV-00247-JAM-DB

COUNTY, APN: 373-192-007-4,  
INCLUDING ALL APPURTENANCES  
AND IMPROVEMENTS THERETO, et  
al.,

Defendants.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Plaintiff,

v.

APPROXIMATELY \$6,567,897.50  
SEIZED FROM CTBC BANK,  
ACCOUNT NUMBER 3800191916, et  
al.,

Defendants.

2:19-CV-00485-JAM-DB

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Plaintiff,

v.

5383 STONEHURST DRIVE,  
MARTINEZ, CALIFORNIA, CONTRA  
COSTA COUNTY, APN: 367-230-018-7,  
INCLUDING ALL APPURTENANCES  
AND IMPROVEMENTS THERETO, et  
al.,

Defendants.

2:19-CV-00636-JAM-DB

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Plaintiff,

v.

RONALD J. ROACH, and  
JOSEPH W. BAYLISS,

Defendants.

2:19-CR-00182-DAD

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE  
COMMISSION,

Plaintiff,

v.

JOSEPH BAYLISS and RONALD  
ROACH

Defendants.

2:19-CV-02140-JAM-DB

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

ROBERT A. KARMANN,

Defendant.

2:19-CR-00222-JAM

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE  
COMMISSION,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ROBERT A. KARMANN,

Defendant.

2:19-CV-02531-JAM-DB

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

JEFFREY P. CARPOFF,

Defendant.

2:20-CR-00017-JAM

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

2 Plaintiff,

3 vs.

4 PAULETTE CARPOFF,

5 Defendant.

2:20-CR-00018-JAM

6  
7 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

8 Plaintiff,

9 vs.

10 RYAN GUIDRY,

11 Defendant.

2:20-CR-00003-JAM

12  
13 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

14 Plaintiff,

15 vs.

16 ALAN HANSEN,

17 Defendant.

2:20-CR-00016-JAM

18  
19 SOLARMORE MANAGEMENT  
20 SERVICES, INC., a California  
corporation,

21 Plaintiff,

22 vs.

23 Bankruptcy Estate of DC SOLAR  
24 SOLUTIONS, INC., dba DC SOLAR  
25 SOLUTIONS MFG, INC. dba DC  
26 SOLAR SOLUTIONS  
MANUFACTURING, INC., a  
California corporation; et al.,

27 Defendants.

2:19-CV-02544-DAD-DB

SOLARMORE MANAGEMENT  
SERVICES, INC., a California  
corporation; CARL AND BARBARA  
JANSEN, a married couple,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

NIXON PEABODY, LLP, a New York  
limited liability partnership; FORREST  
DAVID MILDER, a married  
individual,

Defendants.

2:20-CV-02446-DAD-DB

TO THIS HONORABLE COURT AND ALL PARTIES AND THEIR  
ATTORNEYS OF RECORD,

Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”) hereby provides notice that the above-captioned matters may be related cases within the meaning of Local Rule 123. The SEC is plaintiff in the civil action *Securities and Exchange Commission v. Ari J. Lauer*, Case No. 2:22-CV-01726-CKD. This civil action for enforcement of the federal securities laws involves the same events and transactions as the civil and criminal matters *Securities and Exchange Commission v. Jeffrey P. Carpoﬀ and Paulette Carpoﬀ*, Case No. 2:20-CV-00180-JAM-AC; *United States v. Jeffrey P. Carpoﬀ*, Case No. 2:20-CR-0017-JAM and *United States v. Paulette Carpoﬀ*, Case No. 2:20-CR-0018-JAM.

The scheme that is described in the SEC’s Complaint is also the subject of three civil forfeiture actions, which relate to the proceeds of the scheme, four other criminal actions and four civil actions: *United States v. 725 Main Street, Martinez, California, et al.*, Case 2:19-CV-00247-JAM-DB; *United States v. Approximately \$6,567,897.50 Seized From CTBC Bank, Account Number 380019196, et al.*, Case No. 2:19-CV-00485-JAM-DB; *United States v. 5383 Stonehurst Drive, Martinez,*

1 *California, et al.*, Case No. 2:19-CV-00636-JAM-DB; *United States v. Ronald J.*  
 2 *Roach and Joseph W. Bayliss*, Case No. 2:19-CR-182-DAD; *Securities and Exchange*  
 3 *Commission v. Joseph W. Bayliss and Ronald J. Roach*, Case No. 2:19-CV-2140-  
 4 JAM-DB; *United States v. Karmann*, Case No. 2:19-CR-222-JAM; *Securities and*  
 5 *Exchange Commission v. Karmann*, Case No. 2:19-CV-2531-JAM-DB; *United States*  
 6 *v. Ryan Guidry*, Case No. 2:20-CR-0003-JAM; *United States v. Alan Hansen*, Case  
 7 No. 2:20-CR-0016-JAM; *Solarmore Management Services, Inc. v. Bankruptcy Estate*  
 8 *of DC Solar Solutions, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 2:19-CV-02544-DAD-DB; and  
 9 *Solarmore Management Services, Inc., et al. v. Nixon Peabody, LLP et al.*, Case No.  
 10 2:20-CV-02446-DAD-DB. Reassignment to the same district judge may avoid  
 11 duplication of labor by the Court.

12 In *United States v. 725 Main Street, Martinez, California, et al.*, Case  
 13 2:19-CV-00247-JAM-DB, the United States filed a civil forfeiture complaint against  
 14 real properties that were allegedly purchased using fraud and money laundering  
 15 proceeds from the same scheme that is the subject of the SEC's case.

16 In *United States v. Approximately \$6,567,897.50 Seized From CTBC Bank,*  
 17 *Account Number 3800191916, et al.*, Case No. 2:19-CV-00485-JAM-DB, the United  
 18 States filed a civil forfeiture complaint against bank accounts and other property that  
 19 is associated with, or represents, alleged proceeds from the same scheme that is the  
 20 subject of the SEC's case.

21 In *United States v. 5383 Stonehurst Drive, Martinez, California, et al.*, Case  
 22 No. 2:19-CV-00636-JAM-DB, the United States filed a civil forfeiture complaint  
 23 against real properties that were allegedly purchased using proceeds associated with  
 24 the same scheme that is the subject of the SEC's case.

25 In *United States v. Ronald J. Roach and Joseph W. Bayliss*, Case No. 2:19-CR-  
 26 182-DAD, Defendants Ronald Roach and Joseph Bayliss pled guilty to conspiracy to  
 27 commit the underlying wire fraud that led to the acquisition of the real estate and  
 28 personal assets named as defendants in Case Nos. 2:19-CV-00247-JAM-DB, 2:19-

1 CV-00485-JAM-DB, and 2:19-CV-00636-JAM-DB. Defendant Roach also pled  
2 guilty to criminal securities violations related to that same scheme.

3 In *Securities and Exchange Commission v. Joseph Bayliss and Ronald Roach*,  
4 Case No. 2:19-CV-2140-JAM-DB, a civil action for enforcement of the federal  
5 securities laws was brought against the same defendants and involved the same  
6 events and transactions as the criminal matter *United States v. Ronald J. Roach and*  
7 *Joseph W. Bayliss*, Case No. 2:19-CR-182-DAD. The scheme that is described in the  
8 SEC's Complaint is the subject of three civil forfeiture actions: Case Nos. 2:19-CV-  
9 00247-JAM-DB; 2:19-CV-00485-JAM-DB; and 2:19-CV-00636-JAM-DB, which  
10 relate to alleged proceeds of the scheme.

11 In *United States v. Robert A. Karmann*, Case No. 2:19-CR-222-JAM,  
12 Defendant Karmann pled guilty to conspiracy to commit the underlying wire fraud  
13 that led to the acquisition of the real estate and personal assets named as defendants  
14 in Case Nos. 2:19-CV-00247-JAM-DB, 2:19-CV-00485-JAM-DB, and 2:19-CV-  
15 00636-JAM-DB. Defendant Karmann also pled guilty to criminal securities  
16 violations related to that same scheme.

17 In *Securities and Exchange Commission v. Robert A. Karmann*, Case No. 2:19-  
18 CV-2531-JAM-DB, a civil action for enforcement of the federal securities laws was  
19 brought against the same defendant and involved the same events and transactions as  
20 the criminal matter *United States v. Robert A. Karmann*, Case No. 2:19-CR-222-  
21 JAM. The scheme that is described in the SEC's Complaint is the subject of three  
22 civil forfeiture actions: Case Nos. 2:19-CV-00247-JAM-DB; 2:19-CV-00485-JAM-  
23 DB; and 2:19-CV-00636-JAM-DB, which relate to alleged proceeds of the scheme.

24 In *United States v. Jeffrey P. Carpoﬀ*, Case No. 2:20-CR-0017-JAM and *United*  
25 *States v. Paulette Carpoﬀ*, Case No. 2:20-CR-0018-JAM, Defendants Jeffrey and  
26 Paulette Carpoﬀ were charged by information with conspiring with, among others,  
27 Defendants Roach, Bayliss and Karmann, to commit wire fraud. A portion of the  
28 proceeds of that conspiracy were used to acquire the real estate and personal assets

1 named as defendants in Case Nos.: 19–CV–00247-JAM-DB, 2:19-cv-00485-JAM-  
 2 DB, and 2:19-cv-00636-JAM-DB. Defendants Jeffrey and Paulette Carpoﬀ were also  
 3 charged with money laundering violations related to that same scheme.

4 In *United States v. Ryan Guidry*, Case No. 2:20-CR-0003-JAM, Defendant  
 5 Guidry pled guilty to conspiracy to commit the underlying wire fraud that led to the  
 6 acquisition of the real estate and personal assets named as defendants in Case Nos.  
 7 2:19–CV–00247-JAM-DB, 2:19-CV-00485-JAM-DB, and 2:19-CV-00636-JAM-  
 8 DB. Defendant Guidry also pled guilty to aiding and abetting money laundering  
 9 related to that same scheme.

10 In *United States v. Alan Hansen*, Case No. 2:20-CR-0016-JAM, Defendant  
 11 Hansen pled guilty to conspiracy to commit the underlying wire fraud that led to the  
 12 acquisition of the real estate and personal assets named as defendants in Case Nos.  
 13 2:19–CV–00247-JAM-DB, 2:19-CV-00485-JAM-DB, and 2:19-CV-00636-JAM-  
 14 DB. Defendant Hansen also pled guilty to aiding and abetting money laundering  
 15 related to that same scheme.

16 In *Solarmore Management Services, Inc. v. Bankruptcy Estate of DC Solar*  
 17 *Solutions, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 2:19-CV-02544-DAD-DB and *Solarmore*  
 18 *Management Services, Inc., et al. v. Nixon Peabody, LLP et al.*, Case No. 2:20-CV-  
 19 02446-DAD-DB, civil suits were brought against various entities, including brokers,  
 20 accountants, and bankers, that Plaintiff Solarmore Management Services, Inc. alleges  
 21 aided and abetted DC Solar’s fraud in 20 distinct investment funds. These cases arise  
 22 out of the same scheme that is the subject of the SEC’s case.

23 Owing to these similarities, the above cases tend to fit within the definition of  
 24 related cases provided by Local Rule 123. Under that definition, actions are related  
 25 when “(1) both actions involve the same parties and are based on the same or a  
 26 similar claim; (2) both actions involve the same property, transaction, or event; (3)  
 27 both actions involve similar questions of fact and the same question of law and their  
 28 assignment to the same Judge or Magistrate Judge is likely to effect a substantial



1 savings of judicial effort, either because the same result should follow in both actions  
2 or otherwise; or (4) for any other reasons, it would entail substantial duplication of  
3 labor if the actions were heard by different Judges or Magistrate Judges.” E.D. Cal.  
4 L.R. 123(a). As such, pursuant to Local Rule 123, it is possible, if not likely, that  
5 these matters are related within the meaning of the rule.

6 Assignment of these cases to the same judge, furthermore, may be likely to  
7 effect a savings of judicial effort and other economies by having one judge consider  
8 the substantially similar record and applicable law that will be relevant to sentencing  
9 in the criminal matter, the imposition of any remedies in this civil matter, and any  
10 other matter that may arise in these cases. Accordingly, the undersigned counsel is  
11 obligated under Local Rule 123 to file this notice in each of the above-referenced  
12 actions.

13  
14 Dated: November 29, 2022

15 Respectfully submitted,

16 /s/ Dean M. Conway

17 Dean M. Conway

18 Sarra Cho

19 Counsel for Plaintiff

U.S. Securities and Exchange  
Commission

100 F. Street, N.E.

Washington, D.C. 20549

(202) 551-4412 (Conway)

conwayd@sec.gov

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that on November 29, 2022, a copy of the foregoing document was served upon all counsel of record via ECF and on Ari J. Lauer, *Pro Se*, via email (alauer@lauerlaw.com).

/s/ Dean M. Conway  
Dean M. Conway